

United States Patent and Trademark Office

H'A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,440	10/28/2003	June Ho Park	10125/4124	6766
7590 09/13/2006		EXAMINER		
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione			DUONG, TAI V	
Post Office Box Chicago, IL 6			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5 5 7 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5			2871	•
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/696,440	PARK ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tai Duong	2871			
The MAILING DA	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHICHEVER IS LONG - Extensions of time may be avarafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the If NO period for reply is specification. - Failure to reply within the set of the s	SER, FROM THE MAILING DA ailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 the mailing date of this communication, ied above, the maximum statutory period voor extended period for reply will, by statute, the later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE to date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 June 2006</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>11-26</u> is 7) ☐ Claim(s) is	/are rejected.	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
10) The drawing(s) file Applicant may not a Replacement draw	request that any objection to the cing sheet(s) including the correct	r. a) accepted or b) objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected traminer. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited	(PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pa	tent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Art Unit: 2871

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/22/06 has been entered.

The rejections over Gunjima, Jiang and Uchiyama are withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 11 and Applicant's remarks.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recited feature "the light-diffusion layer *contacts* the backlight unit" of claim 21 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filling date of an

Application/Control Number: 10/696,440

Art Unit: 2871

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 is *inconsistent* with the specification and the drawings. The specification discloses "[A]s seen in FIG. 3, the light-diffusion layer 59 is formed on a *surface of the second polarizing plate* 44b most proximate to the backlight unit 45." (page 11, lines 10-11). Figure 3 shows the light-diffusion layer 59 being disposed <u>not</u> in contact with the lower substrate 40. Claims 12 and 13 are also *inconsistent* with the specification and the drawings. The specification and the drawings do *not* disclose the light-diffusion layer 59 is disposed *in contact* with the lower substrate 40 and the third passivation layer 58. Claim 18 is *inconsistent* with the specification and the drawings. The specification and Fig.3 disclose the first and second prism sheets 45b are *above* the light-diffusion plate 45a, not below. The remaining claims are also rejected since they depend on the indefinite claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/696,440

Art Unit: 2871

In the below rejections over the prior art, it is assumed that claims 11-13 and 18 are consistent with the specification and the drawings. That is, the light-diffusion layer 59 is disposed in contact with the second polarizing plate 44b. Also, unless indicated otherwise by Applicant, the examiner assumes that the Related Art Figs. 1 and 2 are Prior Art.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11, 17, 18 and 20-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kameyama et al (US 6,339,501).

Note Figs. 3 and 4 which identically disclose the claimed liquid crystal display (LCD) device comprising a liquid crystal layer between the lower and upper substrates (the liquid crystal *cell* 5); a first polarizing plate 31 on the upper substrate; a second polarizing plate 1 below the lower substrate, the second polarizing plate having a light-diffusion layer 11 (col. 2, lines 12-14) on a surface thereof; a backlight unit (elements 6-9) below the second polarizing plate; first and second prism sheets (6a, 6b) being above a light-diffusion plate 7 (col. 2, lines 7-17; col. 8, line 22 – col. 10, line 26).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art Figs. 1 and 2 (ARA Figs. 1 and 2) in view of Kameyama et al (US 6,339,501).

The only difference between the LCD device of ARA Figs. 1 and 2 and that of the instant claims is a light-diffusion layer disposed in contact with the second polarizing plate 14b (the third passivation layer 28), the light-diffusion layer having a plurality of projections being formed on one surface thereof. Kameyama et al disclose in Figs. 3 and 4 a LCD device having a light-diffusion layer 11 disposed in contact with the second polarizing plate 1, and the light-diffusion layer having a plurality of projections 111 being formed on one surface thereof. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill the art in view of Kameyama et al to employ in the LCD device of ARA Figs. 1 and 2 a light-diffusion layer disposed in contact with the second polarizing plate 14b (the third passivation layer 28) for obtaining a large area LCD device which is thin, excellent in luminance and excellent in display quality (Kameyama, col. 2, lines 14-16). Also, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a total of Haze of the first polarizing plate and Haze of the second polarizing plate being at least about 40% for reducing backlight Mura phenomenon.

Claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 26 is allowed over the prior art of record. None of the prior art discloses or suggests a LCD device having a structure recited in claim 14 *in combination* with the

Application/Control Number: 10/696,440

Art Unit: 2871

feature "wherein the light-diffusion layer produces an amount of Haze, and a density of the projections is less than a density of beads that would have to be added to one of the adhesive layers to obtain the same amount of Haze".

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (571) 272-2291.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

DUNGT. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINED

D

TVD

09/06